

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## *THE PRINCIPLE OF THE REVISED VERSION.*

IN an article which appeared in the October number of *THE EXPOSITOR* attention was called to the Revised Version, and particularly to what were characterised as the multitudinous petty changes of the text of the Authorised Version which are to be found on its pages.

In the course of the article reference is made to a small volume written by one who soon afterwards became the Chairman of the Company to which the work of revision was entrusted. Notice is called to the fact that in that volume the writer alludes to the temptation into which revisers are ever apt to fall, viz., of using with increased freedom acquired facilities in the process of revision. To that temptation it is stated that the writer of the volume himself became a victim in his capacity as Chairman of the Company; and as a proof of the correctness of the statement it is mentioned that in a specimen-revision of the Authorised Version, as set forth by the writer of the volume, only 75 changes were suggested in the 111 verses of the Sermon on the Mount, whereas there are to be found in the Revised Version of the same portion of Holy Scripture about 127 changes.

Now, in regard of the general subject, it matters but little whether the Chairman did or did not fall a victim to the temptation against which he uttered his warning. It certainly however cannot be proved that he did, unless it be known that he voted for, or otherwise approved of, the additional changes. But this comparatively unimportant

matter may be disposed of in a single line,—the principles on which the specimen-revision and the Revised Version were based were by no means wholly identical.

It is not however an unimportant matter when the writer of the article takes the great responsibility of saying that the Revisers largely exceeded their instructions, and, even further, that they did not adhere to the principles they were commissioned to follow. This grave impeachment it is the object of this paper to answer, and to show that it is not justified by the facts of the case when fully and equitably considered.

For what are the facts of the case? Why, that the first and fundamental Rule laid down for the Revisers was, that they were “To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorised Version *consistently with faithfulness*” (the italics are our own).

Now, with such a rule lying before him, would not every equitable critic be ready to admit that the Rule does in fact recognise a somewhat expansive principle, viz., that faithfulness is to be the ultimate authority to which appeal is to be made; and that the text of the Authorised Version might be changed where the Company might decide that it would not be consistent with faithfulness to retain it. But this limitation to the general direction of the Rule has been commonly quite ignored by the rough and ready critics who have sat in judgment on the Revision. They find changes for which they themselves do not see the necessity, and which they deem it their duty to denounce as superfluous; and yet, if explanations were to be given, these very critics would probably in the sequel allow that the alterations were admissible if the ultimate appeal was to be made to faithfulness.

In a word, the better the scholar and the more accurate the theologian, the more perceptive will he be likely to be of the reasons for any given change that may have been

introduced, and the more qualified to judge whether the principle of faithfulness does really require it or not.

It is by no means denied that there may be a small percentage of alterations which really competent critics, when the reasons for the changes were fully before them, might pronounce to be more strictly accurate than the renderings they displaced, but yet not positively required by the principle of faithfulness. Granted that this may be so, it still may be said, and very fairly said, that the Revisers were all men who were so keenly alive to the differences between mere accuracy and true faithfulness,—for the subject was perpetually coming before them,—that their decisions may, in all cases, claim a close and careful consideration before they are pronounced to be departures from the principles to which as Revisers they were commissioned to adhere.

The whole question of the distinction between mere accuracy and real faithfulness is a very difficult one in such a book as the New Testament. From that blessed Book we deduce doctrine, we derive rules of life, we obtain revelations of the future, and are permitted to catch glimpses of that world beyond the grave on which all else save God's Holy Word is utterly and absolutely silent. When we pause to consider this, we seem compelled to ask whether, in the translation of such a Book, accuracy and faithfulness do not so closely approach to each other that distinctions between them can in many cases never strictly be drawn. Retentions of familiar expressions, or the alleged charm of a favourite rhythm, can never wisely be permitted to exercise any predominating influence in such a momentous work as the revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament. The question and the only question in each particular case must be this, Does the principle of faithfulness, with all the amount of consequential change that it may be found necessarily to involve, justify the

introduction of the altered rendering? The answer to the question, it is obvious, will vary with the varying estimate, on the part of the respondent, of what really constitutes faithfulness, and will certainly also depend on his clearness of perception of the critical or grammatical elements involved in the decision. Still, for the most part, the subject-matter, coupled with a deep feeling of the duty of setting forth, with as much clearness as possible, all that it appears to convey, will be found to supply the ultimate guidance, and to indicate when faithfulness may be confined to little more than what is erroneous and when it can only be secured by strict adherence to linguistic accuracy.

In translating the Greek Testament it must ever be borne in mind that the Book is intrinsically different from all other books, and that the adequate transference of it into our mother tongue must always be a work of exceptional character and exceptional difficulty.

This most patent truth has been far too much lost sight of in the great majority of the criticisms of the Revised Version. It has been assumed far too commonly that all the Revisers had to do, and ought to have confined themselves to doing, was to correct a certain number of generally admitted errors and to leave all else utterly alone. No such limitation however was specified in the Rule that was actually laid down for them.

But we may now profitably pass from these general considerations to some particulars which will help to show very plainly that the Revisers did not "largely exceed their instructions." Their standard was to be faithfulness. They were to make as few alterations as possible consistently with that principle; and if it can be shown that they really did make more alterations than, in the judgment of competent scholars, they ought to have made, then this overplus of alteration must be set down to their having formed too high an estimate of what constituted faithfulness in each

of the particulars of which the overplus was composed. The difficulty however is to arrive at any general idea of the actual magnitude of the overplus. To count up the total number of changes, and then, on the strength of the imposing nature of the resultant figures, to jump at the inference that the overplus of unnecessary alterations must be very large, is clearly utterly fallacious. Out of the total number of changes a very large portion is simply consequential. Certain alterations being agreed upon after careful discussion, it was one of the first duties of men who were to act on the principle of faithfulness to carry out these alterations consistently through the whole work entrusted to them. This common-sense view of their duty is alone sufficient to account for a multitude of small changes, dispersed through the whole of the Revised Version, which the inexperienced reader might consider to be valid evidences of the "over-elaboration and hypercritical exactitude" that is so often attributed to the Revisers.

Again, there is a very large number of changes which might be called sub-consequential, or, as the result not of a single principle of alteration consistently carried out, but of two or more principles, which, when duly observed, would necessitate changes that any one, unacquainted with the principles and their real importance, might very easily consider as palpable examples of conscious violations, on the part of the Revisers, of "the principles they were commissioned to follow." Illustrations of this class of necessitated changes are mentioned in the preface to the Revised Version.

When these and other deductions that could easily be specified are made from the grand total of changes, the remainder will not be found so large as to suggest any safe basis for the assumption that there is probably in that remainder a large residuum of unnecessary changes. If we would find what the residuum really is, it can only be, even

approximately, found by individual and continuous investigation.

To do this on any large scale is not possible in a paper like the present; but as it has been stated that, in the Revised Version of the Sermon on the Mount, there are some fifty-two changes more than are found in a kind of Specimen-Revision drawn up by one who was afterwards Chairman of the Company, let us go briefly through these fifty-two or more changes, and see how many of them can fairly be considered as falling outside of the fundamental Rule of the Company. Changes arising from differences of reading we will leave undiscussed, as they belong to a different department of the controversy. What we are now more particularly engaged on is the question whether the Revisers did or did not introduce in their general work of revision changes, for the justification of which they cannot successfully appeal to the Rules under which the work was entrusted to them. The Specimen-Revision which we use as the sort of assumed minimum of change, was drawn up on the principle of only correcting what the majority of competent scholars would consider to be more or less erroneous. The Revised Version may be considered to have been extended to what was not faithful to the Original. So the question before us is this: Did the Revisers, to any appreciable extent, go further, and overstep the practically specified boundary? This question we will now endeavour to answer, as above specified, from the Sermon on the Mount.

We begin with Matthew v. 1: "Was set," A.V.; "had set down," R.V. It is surely not otherwise than faithful to adopt the rendering of the word which, in passages like the present, is current in the A.V., and to leave "set" for the causative sense (1 Cor. vi. 4).

Chapter v. 9: "The children," A.V.; "sons," R.V. Here it will hardly be doubted that the change is needed in

regard of the substantive. The distinction between *νόσι* and *τέκνα* will often be found to be real and significant. It may be admitted to be more doubtful whether the article should be retained or omitted. It is retained in S.R.,<sup>1</sup> and its retention is defended in a note. The practice of the Revisers however was mainly to be guided by the presence or absence of the article in the Original. The principles on which, according to some grammarians, it might be regarded as latent they did not always consider to be fully made out.

Chapter v. 10: "Which are," A.V. ; "that have been," R.V. Here few will be disposed to deny that it was consistent with faithfulness, as well as intrinsically more correct, to displace the more predicative "which," and to retain the more purely relational "that," as in all the preceding verses. The "have been" the Revisers were always careful to maintain in the case of the Greek perfect, and deemed it required by faithfulness. This point is noted in the Preface, so that such alterations may be regarded in a certain sense as consequential, and dependent on a previously recognised principle,

Chapter v. 11: "Revile," A.V. ; "reproach," R.V. The change was probably made on the ground that in the parallel passage (Luke vi. 22) the word "reproach" was used, and rightly used, by the A.V. ; and further, that it is plainly desirable to reserve the stronger term "revile" for the stronger word *λοιδορέω*, which in the A.V. is commonly so rendered. Faithfulness may certainly be pleaded for this change.

Chapter v. 13: "And to be trodden," A.V. ; "and trodden," R.V. The change is slight, and is due to a difference of reading, but is here noticed, as the general reader might not observe the change of text.

Chapter v. 15: "Candle," A.V. ; "lamp," R.V. ; and

<sup>1</sup> It will be convenient thus to designate the Specimen-Revision to which allusion has been made.

subsequently, "candlestick," A.V.; "stand," R.V. Here in the first case few would probably consider the change otherwise than desirable and faithful. In the second, the change is consequential. The term "candlestick" is not banished from the R.V.; as it is retained (with the A.V.) in Hebrews ix. 2, and five times in the Revelation. There, however, its retention was necessitated. . . . In regard of the change from "giveth light to," A.V.; to "shineth unto," R.V., little need be said. Not only the Original but the tenor of the precept in verse 16 requires that the same translation of *λάμπειν* should be adopted in each verse.

Chapter v. 17: "Am come," A.V.; "came," R.V. This is one of those very numerous changes to which allusion is made in the Preface to the R.V., and will plainly be estimated differently by different scholars. The "am" is of course due to the principle that, with numerous verbs of movement and of cognate import (see exx. in Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. ii. pp. 75, 76, Transl.), it takes the place of "have"; so that we have to limit ourselves to the simple consideration, which is here the most faithful to the exact meaning of the Lord's solemn declaration, the English preterite or the English perfect. The Revisers on careful consideration decided for the former. When the passages in which the purpose of the Lord's coming are similarly alluded to are fully and fairly considered, it will be found, we think, that the Revisers were justified on principles of faithfulness in making the change. Such alterations as the present involve far more than the merely general reader might be led to suppose. In all cases, as here, the context must be taken into careful consideration. The second change in the verse is consequential.

Chapter v. 18: "Pass," A.V.; "pass away," R.V. Here possibly nothing more can be said than this,—that in other and similar passages in the A.V. (Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xxi. 33), though not always (*e.g.* Mark xiii. 30;

Luke xvi. 17) the more common form of expression is adopted. At the end of the verse, "fulfilled" (A.V.) is changed into "accomplished" (R.V.), as the former, in the great majority of the many cases in which the word occurs, is associated with a different Greek word to that which is used in this verse.

Chapter v. 19: "The same," A.V.; "he," R.V. This perhaps *might* have been left alone, as neither one nor the other is perfectly exact, and the principle of faithfulness can thus hardly be definitely invoked. The change, however, may claim James i. 23 (A.V.) for its support. The real principle would seem to be—where the antecedent clause is short, "he" is the natural rendering; where long, "this man" is the most exact as well as obvious rendering, as in James i. 25 (A.V. and R.V.).

Chapter v. 20: "No case," A.V.; "no wise," R.V. The change is plainly designed to obviate any misunderstanding arising from the more modern sense in which "case" is frequently used.

Chapter v. 22: "Whosoever," A.V.; "every one," R.V. Here it is plain that a distinction ought to be recognised and expressed between  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{o}$  and the  $\delta\varsigma$  which follows. This change ought to have appeared in S.R. . . . At the close of this verse "the hell of fire" (R.V.), is substituted, and, it will probably be conceded, not improperly substituted for "hell fire" (A.V.).

Chapter v. 25: "Lest at any time." A.V.; "lest haply," R.V. The principle of faithfulness may here be appealed to, as some slight misunderstanding might arise to the English reader from the words "at any time."

Chapter v. 26: "Till thou hast," A.V.: "till thou have," R.V. This change was made as it was the opinion of the majority that, in sentences such as the present, the conjunctive was more in harmony with the language of the time than the indicative. Both moods are used after "till"

and "until" in the A.V., but the conjunctive seems the more common: see Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. ii. p. 117, Transl. . . . "Uttermost," A.V.; "last," R.V. It must be admitted that this change has often been objected to, and we may own is one of a small class of cases in which exactness can be more successfully pleaded than faithfulness.

Chapter v. 28: "Whosoever," A.V.; "every one," R.V. The case is not quite so strong as in verse 22, but the change may be fully justified as necessary in itself, as well as practically consequential.

Chapter v. 29: "Offend thee," A.V.; "cause thee to stumble," R.V. The correction is certainly needed owing to the meaning now regularly connected with the word "offend." The correction was very carefully discussed, and has been, I believe, carried through all the many passages in which the word *σκανδαλίζω* occurs, with the exception of five or six passages (*e.g.* Matt. xiii. 5, 7, xv. 42, xxvi. 31, 33; Mark vi. 3, xiv. 27, 29), all passages with a personal reference, which did not admit of the current correction, but where the meaning could not easily be mistaken. In these cases the change appears in the margin. . . . In this verse and in verse 30, "that" is omitted in each of the concluding members, as bringing out more sharply and clearly the meaning of the Original.

Chapter v. 31: "Hath been said," A.V.; "was said," R.V. In accordance with A.V. in verses 21, 27. The same correction is introduced in verse 33, and is obviously required if any consistency is to be maintained.

Chapter v. 34: "Heaven," A.V.; "the Heaven," R.V. The article is inserted in accordance with the Greek, and in harmony with its insertion before "earth" by A.V. in verse 35. In the words that follow, the slight change of order, "the throne of God" ("God's throne," A.V.), is necessitated by the altered rendering in verse 35, "the footstool of His

feet" ("His footstool," A.V.), a fuller rendering required by faithfulness to the original, and maintained in the seven other passages in which the expression occurs in the New Testament.

Chapter v. 35: "Neither by," A.V.; "nor by," R.V. The change here can hardly appeal directly to the principle of faithfulness, yet few, we suppose, will deny that it tends to clearness to place "nor" twice after the first "neither," and then to follow (ver. 36) with another "neither" when the subject takes a slightly new turn. It is not easy in a continuance of negative members to lay down any very strict rules. The reader who is interested in the subject will find a large collection of examples in Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. iii. p. 345 sqq., Transl.

Chapter v. 37: "Cometh of evil," A.V.; "is of the evil one," R.V. Change due to the deliberate decision made subsequently as to the translation of τοῦ πονηροῦ in the Lords prayer; see comment on chapter vi. 13. The other change ("and," R.V.) in this verse is not alluded to as S.R. practically makes a change (by omission). Under any circumstances the translation "for" (A.V.) is not faithful.

Chapter v. 38: "Hath been said," A.V.; "was said," R.V.: see comment on verse 31.

Chapter v. 39: "That ye resist not evil," A.V.; "Resist not him that is evil," R.V. Practically consequential on the decision in reference to verse 37.

Chapter v. 40: "Will sue thee at the law," A.V.; "would go to law with thee," R.V. The alteration was made to simplify, and to maintain a little more definitely, the force of τῷ θέλοντι.

Chapter v. 41: "A mile," A.V.; "one mile," R.V. In accordance with the Original, and as better bringing out the contrast, "one" and "twain."

Chapter v. 43: "Hath been said," A.V.; "was said," R.V.; see comment on verse 31.

Chapter v. 45: "The children," A.V.; "sons," R.V.; see comment on verse 9. In the two clauses that follow A.V. repeats the "on" in each case in the second member; R.V. omits it; and on a principle generally observed in the Revision: it being found that in several passages precision in this particular was of real importance.

Chapter v. 46: "Which love," A.V.; "that love," R.V.; see comment on verse 10.

Chapter v. 48: "Be ye therefore," A.V.; "ye therefore shall be," R.V. The imperatival force of the future may perhaps be rightly recognised in categorical sentences when in a negative form. It is very doubtful whether in sentences like the present the imperatival translation can correctly be maintained. The Revisers were certainly justified in making the change.

Chapter vi. 1. In this verse beside the change also found in S.R. there are two small changes, "else" (R.V.) instead of "otherwise" (A.V.), and "with" (R.V.) instead of "of" (A.V.). In regard of the second there can be no doubt; but in regard of the first, it may be admitted that in good English "otherwise" is used where "else" might have seemed more natural (see Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. iii. p. 357, Transl.), and thus that the change is not positively required by faithfulness. Comparison with other passages however (*e.g.* Matt. ix. 17, Luke v. 37, and xiv. 32 in which passages A.V. adopts "else") seemed to show that the sense was brought out more sharply and clearly by "else," and the change was made accordingly.

Chapter vi. 2: "Thine alms," A.V.; "alms," R.V. The pronoun *may*, from the nature of the sentence, be latent, but it is not expressed in the Original. There are two further changes, "sound not" (R.V.), instead of "do not sound" (A.V.), a change which certainly expresses best the distinctly expressed prohibition of the Greek, and "they have received" (R.V.), instead of "they have"—a

change designed to convey, as far as a few simple words can effect it, that it is a receiving *to the full* even in the case of those spoken of. They do their alms to have glory of men, and they get fully what they seek,—but nothing more, no recompense such as is spoken of in verse 4. Whether the change of tense is desirable, and whether “they fully get their reward” would not have been a somewhat preferable alteration may be left to the judgment of our readers. Faithfulness, at any rate, requires some recognition of the ἀπέχθειν.

Chapter vi. 3: “Right,” A.V.; “right hand,” R.V. If the substantive is supplied in the one case, it certainly ought to be supplied in the other. It *is* supplied in S.R.; but, by mistake, is not marked as a correction.

Chapter vi. 4: “Reward,” A.V.; “recompense,” R.V. Plainly necessary, to mark the distinction between what came from men and from God.

Chapter vi. 5: “Pray standing,” A.V.; “stand and pray,” R.V. The correction prevents “standing” being merely connected with what follows, and brings out the studiedly ceremonious character of the act. Standing was the attitude the Jew customarily assumed in prayer. . . . The change at the close of the verse is the same as in verse 2.

Chapter vi. 6: “Closet,” A.V.; “inner chamber,” R.V. More clear, and differing only slightly from the rendering of A.V. in Matthew xxiv. 26. Of the two remaining changes in the verse, the first, “having shut” (“when thou hast shut,” A.V.), is more true to the structure in the Original and more graphic; the second is in accordance with verse 4.

Chapter vi. 7. “But when ye pray,” A.V.; “and in praying,” R.V. The sequence of thought clearly requires “and” rather than “but”; and the participial rendering rightly fixes the attention more on the act than the time of performing it. The only other change, “Gentiles”

("heathen," A.V.) is more true to the prevalent rendering of the substantive, and is practically in harmony with A.V. in Galatians ii. 14.

Chapter vi. 8: "Be not ye," A.V.; "Be not," R.V. The introduction of "ye" in A.V. suggests an emphasis of which there is no trace in the Original.

Chapter vi. 13: "Lead," A.V.; "bring," R.V. The change is of some importance. It is, in the first place, nearer to the Original; and, in the next place, it helps somewhat to suggest the true thought, viz., that God may be said to bring men into temptation when, in His general and providential government of the world, He brings them into, so to speak, temptation-bearing circumstances, from which, however, a way of escape is ever mercifully provided: see Meyer *in loc.*, and comp. 1 Corinthians x. 13. . . . In reference to the change "the evil one" (R.V.) instead of "evil" (A.V.), more cannot here be said than this,—that the change was made with the greatest deliberation, and with the fullest recognition of the fundamental rule.

Chapter vi. 16: "Appear," A.V.; "be seen," R.V. The purpose of those spoken of and their hypocrisy are thus brought out more clearly. The concluding change has already been alluded to (ver. 2).

Chapter vi. 18. Same change as in verse 16. The concluding change ("recompense," R.V., for "reward," A.V.) has been noticed, verse 4.

Chapter vi. 19: "Corrupt," A.V.; "consume," R.V.). It was not a corrupting, but a putting out of sight, and so, practically, a making away with altogether. Perhaps in verse 16 "hide" or "conceal" would have been more true than "disfigure."

Chapter vi. 22: "Light," A.V.; "lamp," R.V. as in chapter v. 55.

Chapter vi. 23: "That darkness," A.V.; "the darkness," R.V. As in the Original.

Chapter vi. 25: "Take no thought," A.V.; "be not anxious," R.V. Change is also here made in S.R., so that, properly speaking, this correction need not here be noticed. S.R. however and R.V. differ, the former taking the word "careful," the latter the word "anxious." On the whole, considering the tenor of the context, we may rightly give the preference to R.V.

Chapter vi. 26: "The fowls of the air," A.V.; "the birds of the heaven," R.V. The rendering "birds" is found five times in A.V. The rendering "heaven" is, I believe, uniformly maintained. Here principle can hardly be appealed to. Few however can reasonably object to the change. . . . Of the two remaining changes in the verse, the "and" (R.V.) instead of "yet" (A.V.) is absolutely required, and ought to have appeared in S.R. The change in the last member, "more value" (R.V.) instead of "better" (A.V.), obviates any possible misconception as to that in which the *διαφέρειν* consists.

Chapter vi. 27, 28. Changes in accordance with change in verse 25.

Chapter vi. 29: "And yet," A.V.; "yet," R.V. The "and" is superfluous.

Chapter vi. 30: "So clothe," A.V.; "doth so clothe," R.V. This slight addition has a principle behind it. The revisers felt that it was most consistent with faithfulness to translate, where possible, *εἰ* with the indicative by "if," followed, not by the subjunctive, but by the indicative. The "doth" was thus inserted to make the mood plain. The use of "if" with the indicative or conjunctive is well discussed in Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol ii. p. 119, Transl.

Chapter vi. 31: "Take no thought," A.V. See comment on verse 25. The position of "therefore" in A.V. at the beginning gives to the word too much emphasis, and is therefore rightly changed in R.V.; comp. A.V. in verse 34.

Chapter vi. 34: "Take no thought" (twice), A.V. See comment on verse 25. The change from "shall" (A.V.) to "will" (R.V.) is made in accordance with the grammatical person (see Maetzner, *Engl. Gramm.*, vol. ii. p. 80, Transl.) and the purely future tenor of the clause.

Chapter vii. 4, 5. It is obvious that in these two verses the verb ἐκβάλλειν ought to have the same translation. "Cast out" seems the most natural rendering, and is thus in R.V. maintained in both verses. In verse 4 the lighter "lo" (R.V.) is,—especially when the subject of the verse is considered,—to be preferred to "behold" (A.V.) In verse 5 the πρῶτον is unemphatic. The rendering then ought to be "cast out first" (R.V.) rather than "first cast out" (A.V.)

Chapter vii. 6: "Cast ye," A.V.; "cast," R.V. The "ye" is clearly superfluous. The two remaining changes, "lest haply" (R.V.) and "turn" (R.V.) are required, "lest" (A.V.) being insufficient, and "turn again" (A.V.) more than sufficient, though possibly defensible as idiomatic.

Chapter vii. 9, 10. The changes in these verses are slightly complicated with changes of reading in the original. The verses are also dealt with in S.R., and thus do not come within the scope of these comments, which only relate to the additions to S.R.

Chapter vii. 12: "Therefore all things," A.V.; "all things therefore," R.V. See comment on chapter vi. 31. It may be admitted that the twice-repeated "unto" (R.V.) instead of "to" (A.V.) cannot be claimed as dependent on faithfulness. It was made to improve the rhythm. The remaining change, "even so do ye also" (R.V.), instead of "do ye even so" (A.V.), is suggested partly by euphony, partly by the desirableness of bringing the verb nearer to its dependent dative, and of maintaining the emphasis in the καὶ ὑμεῖς.

Chapter vii. 13: "Many there be which go in thereat," A.V.; "many be they that enter in thereby," R.V. In these few words there are as many as four changes, and yet few would, on consideration, deny that the result is a closer and more faithful rendering. The first change brings out more sharply the persons concerned; the second preserves, as in the first clause, the lighter relative; the third helps the same translation of this same word in the same verse; the fourth is consequential, and due to the necessary change in the *διά*. Is such care of rendering in such a momentous verse out of harmony with the true spirit of Rule I.?

Chapter vii. 14: "Because," A.V.; "for," R.V., as in verse 13; the particle is the same. The other changes are either as in S.R. or consequential.

Chapter vii. 16: "Ye shall know them by their fruits," A.V.; "by their fruits ye shall know them," R.V. Necessary to maintain the emphasis of the original. See verse 20.

Chapter vii. 20: "Wherefore," A.V.; "Therefore," R.V.; a slight but necessary correction.

Chapter vii. 24: "Therefore whosoever," A.V.; "Every one therefore which," R.V. See comments on chapter v. 22, and on chapter vi. 31: compare also verse 26 (A.V.) in this chapter. [It would have been better if the lighter relative had been adopted, as in verse 26.] . . . The change "words" (R.V.) for "sayings" (A.V.) is clearly desirable both here and in verses 26 and 28 as more inclusive; consider such a passage as Mark viii. 38.

Chapter vii. 27: "Beat upon," A.V.; "smote upon," R.V. The word in the original is a different word to that in verse 25, and of stronger meaning. The concluding change "thereof" (R.V.) instead of "of it" (A.V.) cannot appeal to faithfulness; but few probably who will read the verse aloud will disapprove of it.

Chapter vii. 28: "Doctrine," A.V.; "teaching," R.V.

The change is due to the fact that the word "doctrine" was more commonly adopted by the Revisers as the rendering of *διδασκαλία*. The change also harmonises better with the word "taught" that follows.

We have now concluded our examination of, we believe, all the alterations, other than those due to various readings, in which the Revised Version differs from that Specimen Version which the writer of the article in the October number refers to, and appears to regard as a kind of *terminus a quo* from which excess of alteration might fairly be estimated. We have to express our regret to the general reader that the discussion has taken up so much space, but it is only thus that the charge brought against the Revisers of having "largely exceeded their instructions," and of having "not adhered to the principles they were commissioned to follow," can fully be met. It is thus only that the equitable reader can settle for himself whether the changes, of which he has a continuous list from a connected portion of Holy Scripture of some length, do, or do not, deserve to be characterised as "unnecessary and uninformative alterations," or whether any changes in any part of a work, of which the reader has now had a specimen, presumably deserve to be spoken of as "irritating trivialities."

Such language in such subjects as the present is to be deprecated; but it must be dealt with and calmly put to the test.

It has now been put to the test, and the reader is now invited to consider whether the principle of faithfulness cannot be recognised as permeating the great majority of the changes, and whether those, in which it may be less patent, are not still due to its general influence rather than to the merely accelerative tendencies of increased literary facilities.

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.